

Rex Holmes F39-W7-Assessment

| Array | Insert Time | Append Time | Total Time |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| extraLargeArray | 696.482916 ms | 4.988667 ms | 701.471583 ms |
| largeArray | 5.795959 ms | 334 μ s | 6.130959 ms |
| mediumArray | 121.5 μ s | 75 μ s | 196.5 μ s |
| smallArray | 21.25 μ s | 42.25 μ s | 63.5 μ s |
| tinyArray | 12.75 μ s | 36.666 μ s | 49.416 μ s |

I see that as the arrays get smaller, obviously, so does both the insert and append time, but eventually the insert time ends up taking less time than the append time the smaller the array gets. The `doublerAppend` function has a time complexity of $O(n)$. The `doublerInsert` function has a time complexity of $O(n^2)$. The `doublerAppend` function actually scales better though because the time it takes to execute the function grows linearly with the size of the input array, compared to the `doublerInsert` function which grows quadratically with the size of the input array. This is because the `unshift()` is inside the for loop and, for each iteration, it has to shift all the elements that were previously inserted. Like we were taught in the lectures, it would be better to just build the array in the reverse order and then reverse it at the end and make the time complexity $O(n)$.